

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA
LAFAYETTE DIVISION

HAROLD HUGHES, JR.

CASE NO. 6:24-CV-00648 SEC P

VERSUS

JUDGE DAVID C. JOSEPH

BOBBY GUIDROZ, ET AL

MAGISTRATE JUDGE WHITEHURST

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Plaintiff Harold Hughes, Jr. filed a civil rights complaint, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, on May 13, 2024. Doc. 1. At that time, the address provided to the Court was for the W. Baton Rouge Transitional Work Facility in Port Allen, Louisiana. On June 20, 2024, plaintiff notified the Court of a change of address to 9450 Highway 65 South, Lake Providence, 71254 (the River Bend Detention Center). Doc. 8.

On February 6, 2025, an Order was mailed to plaintiff at his last known address, the River Bend Detention Center. Doc. 15. On February 25, 2025, that order was returned, marked “Return to Sender. Not Deliverable as Addressed. Unable to Forward.” Doc. 17. According to Vinelink, plaintiff has been released from custody. See <https://vinelink.vineapps.com/search/>.

Local Rule (LR) 41.3W provides in part, “The failure of a [...] pro se litigant to keep the court apprised of an address change may be considered cause for dismissal for failure to prosecute when a notice is returned to the court for the reason of an incorrect address and no correction is made to the address for a period of thirty days.” More than thirty days have elapsed since the Court’s correspondence was returned.

Therefore,

IT IS RECOMMENDED that the instant complaint be **DISMISSED** in accordance with the provisions of LR41.3W.

Under the provisions of 28 U.S.C. Section 636(b)(1)(C) and Rule 72(b), parties aggrieved by this recommendation have fourteen (14) business days from service of this report and recommendation to file specific, written objections with the Clerk of Court. A party may respond to another party's objections within fourteen (14) days after being served with a copy of any objections or response to the district judge at the time of filing.

Failure to file written objections to the proposed factual findings and/or the proposed legal conclusions reflected in this Report and Recommendation within fourteen (14) days following the date of its service, or within the time frame authorized by Fed.R.Civ.P. 6(b), shall bar an aggrieved party from attacking either the factual findings or the legal conclusions accepted by the District Court, except upon grounds of plain error. *See, Douglass v. United Services Automobile Association, 79 F.3d 1415 (5th Cir. 1996).*

THUS DONE AND SIGNED in chambers this 1st day of April, 2025.



Carol B. Whitehurst
United States Magistrate Judge